DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 381 485 SP 035 645

AUTHOR Cosgrove, Maryellen; And Others
TITLE A Tale of Two Professional Development Schools.
PUB DATE 13 Oct 94
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at a meeting of the Georgia Association of Teacher Educators (Atlanta, Georgia, October 13, 1994).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College School Cooperation; *Educational Research; Faculty Development; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Intermediate Grades; Junior High Schools; Middle Schools; Partnerships in Education; Preservice Teacher Education; *Professional Development Schools; *Program Development; Student Teaching; *Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Role; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS Armstrong State College GA; Experienced Teachers; Preservice Teachers; *Teacher Development

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the goals, planning, governance, faculty roles, faculty development, and research activities at two professional development schools (PDSs) affiliated with Armstrong State College (Georgia). The college launched PDS partnerships with White Bluff Elementary School and Bartlett Middle School in September 1993. The roles of cooperating and other classroom teachers, college faculty liaison, and site-based supervisor are discussed. At both schools, reciprocity characterizes faculty development; both college and school faculty help to shape the professional development program at each institution. Collaborative inquiry is also an objective of each site, and formative and summative evaluation of program goals is an integral part of the program. Several examples of current and planned research activities are provided. Program goals include: (1) developing and implementing field sites, based on supportive partnerships, for preservice teachers; (2) maintaining innovative field-based experiences that reflect the social and racial balance of the school community; (3) utilizing faculty from school and college sites to develop curriculum and teach courses at all sites; (4) identifying and developing research-based supervision strategies; (5) fostering preservice and inservice teacher engagement in inquiry and reflective practice; (6) keeping teacher preparation at Armstrong State College dynamic and proactive; and (7) documenting the disseminating information about the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the PDS partnerships. (Contains 39 references.) (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 381 485

A TALE OF TWO PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOLS

Maryellen Cosgrove, Elementary PDS Coordinator

Pamela Harwood, Middle PDS Coordinator

Lloyd Newberry, Dean School of Education

It was the best of times (250% increase in the teacher education program in five years) and the worst of times (limited sites for field practicums and internships) which led our faculty to consider and explore the implementation of an elementary and a middle professional development school. However, a thorough review of the literature provided us with a solid knowledge-base but did not yield specific guidelines regarding "how to" design our partnership. Since "necessity is the mother of invention" we created our own model which ultimately became quite different for both schools. We are presently in the third year of our two partnerships and our on-going program assessments have indicated that both models - although quite different - are equally effective. This paper will briefly review the literature and then describe our goals, planning, roles, faculty development, and research in both sites. We will summarize the similarities of both models with implications for other PDS's.

The term professional development school (PDS) first appeared in 1986 in the Holmes Group report. The goal of the PDS as envisioned by this group was the involvement of prospective teachers, experienced teachers and university

SP035645

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M Cosgrove

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

faculty in collaborative partnerships. The premise was that university faculty and inservice teachers have the experience with which the preservice teachers could use to construct knowledge about teaching. The end result would be a reformed teacher education program (Stanulis, 1994).

> By professional development we do not mean just a lab school for university research, nor a demonstration school. Nor do we mean just a clinical setting for preparing student and intern teachers. Rather we mean all of these together - a school for the development of novice professionals, for the continuing development of experienced professionals, and for the research and development of the teaching profession (Holmes Report, 1990, p. 1).

An essential component of teacher education programs is the practicum and student teaching field experiences to connect theory with practice as in an apprenticeship. Advocates of the PDS, including the Association of Teacher Education, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development,and Carnegie Task Force on Teaching, compare the role of a PDS to that of a teaching hospital in which the schools will have a key role in the reform of teacher education and the improvement of teaching and learning (Abdal-Haqq, 1992).

According to Arends (1990), "although universities, through their schools of education have been historically linked to the public schools, these linkages have been weak. Today's challenge for universities is to find new and differ-

ent ways to connect with schools so that the resources of the university can be put to work in appropriate and beneficial ways" (117-118). Goodlad (1990) and Winitzky, Stoddart, and O'Keefe (1992) note that educators can no longer remain complacent about the current disjuncture between schools and teacher education programs in terms of conflict of pedagogy, replication and reflection.

The faculty at Armstrong State College (ASC) School of Education has consistently incorporated field experiences into teacher education courses because we believe that the resources, services, and expertise of school teachers are necessary to truly collaborate in the preparation of pre-service teachers. So during the 1991-2 school year, we formally endorsed the creation of two professional development schools based on the following assumptions:

1. Practicum and student teaching field experiences are a critical part of teacher preparation.
2. A partnership must be developed with public schools so that field experiences are maximally successful.
3. Classroom teachers are also teacher educators.
4. The college and school faculty should organize themselves as a community of learners.
5. Inservice and preservice teachers are the conduit of change for the teacher education program.
6. Reflection and research on best practice must be an integral part of the partnership.

Both schools are urban and racially balanced and are

accredited by SACS, operate within the site-based management model, and have received Meritorious School status. White Bluff Elementary (WBES) is a prekindergarten to grade five school with 900 students and 66 staff members. Its programs include three and four year old Intervention Pre-School, Special Needs Kindergarten, four year old Preschool, Mildly and Moderately and Severely Intellectually Disabled, Emotional/Behavior Disorders, Learning Disabled, Speech Pathology, Instructional Assistance, Chapter I, Remedial Education, Search, and Write-to-Read and computer labs.

Bartlett Middle School (BMS) serves approximately 1,250 students in grades six through eight with 105 staff members. It operates under the middle school concept in which each student belongs to a team with 90 to 150 other students. Each team selects its own name and mascot and is taught by a group of four core teachers plus related arts teachers. Instructional faculty is certified in middle grades (4-8), secondary grades (7-12), alternative preparation and "state letter". Under the direction of a new principal, the faculty is beginning to implement the Total Quality Managment model.

Goals

Although the development of our PDS's is on-going, faculty at ASC and the two professional development schools are guided by the following goals:

1. to define, develop, and implement a supportive partnership as field based sites for preservice

teachers,

2. to maintain innovative field based experiences reflective of the social and racial balance of the school community,
3. to share faculty at the three sites in the development of curriculum and teaching of courses,
4. to identify and develop research based supervision and instructional strategies to serve all students,
5. to foster a research milieu in order to assist preservice and inservice teachers to engage in inquiry and reflective practice.
6. to keep teacher preparation at Armstrong State College dynamic and proactive, and
7. to document and disseminate the planning, development, implementation, and evaluative stages of the PDS partnerships.

Formative evaluation of these goals includes naturalistic research instruments such as interviews, questionnaires and observation. The graduate questionnaire (already in place at ASC) is the summative assessment instrument. Triangulation and comparative data analyses identify the extent to which the program goals are met. Reflection through re-evaluation of the quantitative and qualitative data analyses guides the continuation of the PDS programs.

Planning

The planning of a PDS requires faculty who are cognizant of the delicate interorganizational relations required of

the partnership (Arends, 1990). Organic collaboration in which ideas and issues are jointly solved through frequent and extended dialogue are needed so that a consensus on mission and roles are identified (Dixon & Ishler, 1992; James, Etheridge & Liles, 1991).

White Bluff Elementary School:

White Bluff Elementary School and ASC have always had a collegial relationship which formally evolved into a PDS partnership when the Dean of the School of Education approached the Principal of WBES during the fall 1992 quarter. An initial task force of six WBES cooperating teachers and three ASC supervisors was formed. They met four times from January to May 1993 to discuss partnership goals and roles, field experience scheduling, joint research projects, and improved communication. (The schools are presently writing a grant proposal requesting funds for e-mail, but in the meantime, the ASC "box" in the WBES mailroom has helped.) The experienced cooperating teachers also designed a list of suggestion for their colleagues who agreed to supervise student teachers for the first time during the 1993-4 school year.

Bartlett Middle School:

Unlike WBES, the impetus towards forming a PDS partnership came from the BMS faculty. During the 1992-3 school year, a member of the Building Leadership Team (BLT) suggested the possibility of ASC sponsoring their college students the ASC Division of Curriculum and Instruction faculty voted

to accept BMS's invitation and plan a PDS partnership.

The first order of business was to appoint a steering committee. Two faculty from Bartlett and three faculty from ASC were appointed by their respective administrators. From Jan. to March 1993 very little was acccomplished due to barriers of finding mutual meeting times, establishing common goals within diametrically opposed systems, and recognizing that the PDS would be a time consuming addendum to rather than an integral part of either schools' mission.

In March 1993, the ASC members of the steering committee were invited to a Bartlett Middle School faculty weekend retreat, however, only one ASC member was able to attend. A purpose of the retreat was to refine the goals and articulate challenges. During extensive discussion, it became apparent to the ASC member, that there were some very fundamental differences in the culture, programs, and administrative parameters on both campuses which called for an extended "get acquainted" period before the goals could be addressed.

Finally though, in September 1993, a kick-off celebration on the ASC campus launched our partnership with both White Bluff Elementary and Bartlett Middle Schools.

Roles

A clear identification and understanding of the roles of the school and college faculty members are essential for the success of a PDS partnerhip. "A real collaboration involves giving up historic control and power to forge a

new relationship" (Michelle, 1994, p. 3). A college faculty liaison is necessary whose role is to coordinate the field experiences, model effective teaching strategies, offer staff development programs, analyze data, and disseminate the results to both campuses (Arends, 1990; Ferris, 1990; Clark & LaBonde,1992; Sandholtz & Merseth, 1992; Stahlhut & Hawkes, 1992; Winitsky, Stoddard and O'Keefe, 1992). The role of teachers is to provide supervision, feedback, evaluation and instruction to preservice teachers and input into the program (Arends, 1990; Ferris, Henniger & Bischoff, 1991). The role of the school sites cannot be overlooked either. Abdal-Haqq (1992) and Meade (1991) write that the schools are settings which reflect specific teaching practices that respond to cultural demographic realities in terms of race, economics, and the diversity of learning abilities of its students. Faculty and staff within the PDS accept "the challenge of having a dual mission" to educate their students while at the same time prepare preservice teachers (James et al, 1991, p. 26). However Glickman (1993) stresses that the roles must be collegial and equivalent and only through a thoughtful and democratic governance process can the participants begin to reach an understanding of the meaning of learning and teaching.

White Bluff Elementary School:

The role of the college liaison emerged into that of a site-based supervisor by spending one entire day and three half days at White Bluff. However, her time is spent in

different ways as compared to the traditional model. The college supervisor works less with the preservice students as an observer and more with classroom teachers as a supportive resource. Together they identify pressing issues and the college supervisor then conducts seminars and/or small group meetings for the preservice teachers. Besides supervision, the classroom teachers also mentor ASC students who are taking reading, reading practicum, language arts, health and physical education, exceptional children, methods and materials, and curriculum courses. They have also written a WBES Student Teacher Handbook and organize a welcome reception each quarter. Even though 46 preservice teachers have been placed in 26 different classrooms, the entire school is involved in the supervision and evaluation of student teachers. It's not uncommon to have other support staff, including the custodian, stop the college supervisor in the corridor to share an interesting anecdote about an ASC student! This spirit of collaboration between both faculties also converged into their joint sponsorship of the First Annual Storytelling Concert held on the ASC campus.

Bartlett Middle School:

The Bartlett faculty perceived their primary role as preparation of future teachers. However, this perspective took on a life of its own. Currently, the Bartlett faculty hosts bi-monthly seminars for the preservice and cooperating teachers. Issues raised during these meetings have triggered a critical review of the two teacher preparation programs -

degree and alternative tracks. After much discussion, the BMS PDS Committee voted to focus on four objectives specific to the teacher prepartion program at ASC. These include (1) mentor - mentee process, (2) student teaching process, (3) support staff process, and (4) partnership process with an emphasis on expanding the PDS membership to include faculty from the ASC School of Arts and Sciences.

Faculty Development

Researchers advocate that a necessary component for the success of PDS partnerships is the implementation of on-going continuing education of the schools' teachers so as to minimize, if not eliminate, the current conflicts of pedagogy between colleges and schools (Abdal-Haqq, 1992; Ferris et al, 1991; Garland & Shippy, 1991; Meade, 1991; Rushcamp & Roehler, 1992). The initial focus of the partnership should be in the development of interpersonal and supervisory relationships and a common vocabulary of current instructional practices. Ultimately, the teachers ought to be encouraged to identify and understand research which addresses the challenges of supervising student teachers.

White Bluff Elementary School:

Faculty development in the ASC-WBES model is truly a two-way process. By meeting with the WBES teachers prior to each field based course and then following-up with a questionnaire, the ASC faculty have made many changes in their course content and activities. Furthermore, WBES teachers

have participated in panel discussions during several college courses and conducted a behavior management workshop. The college instructors, as well as the students, gained much insight into the realities of schooling today.

Besides 41 White Bluff teachers taking the TSS course, the entire faculty will participate in a technology workshop sponsored by ASC. Faculty input into the recommendation of course outcomes and portfolio entries has contributed to their own development. They also responded to a questionnaire describing what they have learned as a result of the partnership. Comments such as "I've learned to analyze the effectiveness of my teaching", "I'm more aware of how I interact with children", and "I've learned new activities from my student teachers" are cited by many teachers.

Professional libraries on both campuses have grown as a result of a book exchange of college and school textbooks. The White Bluff teachers now have current textbooks to use for their own development and as a reference to further understand the field based assignments. The college faculty now has a collection of elementary student textbooks which are used during content and professional courses.

Bartlett Middle School:

The Bartlett - ASC model also focuses on inservice faculty development as reciprocal staff development. With the challenges in the middle school and the diversity of the teacher preparation backgrounds (i.e. 4-8 and 7-12 degree, alternative and state letter), the perception of the Bart-

lett faculty was that the ASC faculty needed a healthy dose of the "real world" in the new middle school concept. An open house was held for ASC faculty including both education and arts and science faculties.

ASC faculty has been involved in BMS in a variety of activities with student teaching and practicums being the most prevalent. One ASC course has been taught on the Bartlett campus and BMS faculty has also taught courses at ASC.

This current school year has already shown "soft signs" of professional growth. Supervising teachers have met with the ASC liaison to discuss student teaching requirements. Many Bartlett faculty members who are not presently supervising student teachers also attended the meeting. One decision that was made involved the introduction of the pre-service teachers to their classes as an "ASC teacher" and not as a "student teacher" which often set them up for failure. The PDS committee is also in the process of revising some student teaching assignments, such as the case study. And the media specialist has begun to build a professional library from ASC faculty's donated textbooks and journals.

Research

Meade (1991) and Zeichner (1992) envision the PDS as grounding theory into practice through the reflective analyses of instructional conteht and delivery to diverse learners. The concept of PDS partnerships should also be a subject of inquiry. Furthermore, Arends (1990) states

programs of research would be designed to examine

> the match between teacher education processes and outcomes and the underlying beliefs and assumptions behind these processes. Programs of research will examine the effects, both positive and negative, of the faculty's efforts to link more closely with the schools (pp. 139 - 140).

White Bluff Elementary School:

As a result of the teacher questionnaire analysis, the college liaison has guided and assisted the PDS teachers in their efforts to reflect upon their own instructional strategies and interpret the recent knowledge base of best practice. Ultimately the teachers,as consumers and producers of research, are applying their findings in the classrooms while instructing their students and supervising preservice teachers. This collaborative inquiry has also resulted in the development of a new student teacher grading form and the piloting of a preservice peer observation project. During the 1993-4 school year kindergarten teachers participated in a study to determine the relationship between parental reading aloud and their children's writing competencies. Many third through fifth grade teachers expressed a concern regarding spelling instruction so they devised a questionaire to help them determine effective strategies. The college liaison has been able to benefit from teaching courses on the White Bluff campus by triangulating both observation and self-study descriptive data in Project SPILL (Student Partners in Literacy Learning).

But the most exciting and, hopefully, fruitful research is yet to come! With the awarding of grant funds from two sources, White Bluff Elementary School is now a distance learning site in which students taking courses on campus will be able to immediately transfer theory to reality. Furthermore, preservice teachers will collaboratively plan and teach lessons with their peers from a private rural college. In the spirit of qualitative research, this innovative project will continuously refocus the study.

Bartlett Middle School:

There has been one action research activity requested by the Bartlett BLT. The emotional issue was the inclusion model of service delivery for special education. A survey was developed by the ASC liaison and the BLT team. There was a 100% return rate indicating strong opinions regarding this concept. Based on the analysis of the questionnaire responses, the ASC member conducted a follow-up workshop session to further identify issues and solutions about inclusion in the middle school.

Summary

Thoughtful and reflective planning is essential in the creation of professional development schools because the reforms involve major changes in the roles and responsibilities of the partners. The PDS is not a quick fix but a fundamental change that will "enable teachers to assume their rightful place as leaders of educational reform and teacher educators to assume their proper role in helping

teachers do so, for the benefit of everybody's children" (Zeichner, 1992, p. 304). Truly the PDS's are centers for teaching and learning of all participants.

Partners in the Armstrong State College model are committed to the concept of a PDS as an effort to reach a consensus on the most effective way to prepare educators to enter into the teaching profession in the 1990's and empower them to continue to learn into the twenty-first century.

Implications common to both models include:

1. The developing partnership must take place over time in order to allow for growth and reflection.
2. The partnership must be based on input from both school-based and campus-based educators.
3. A specific model can't be imposed but must reflect the real needs of both the preservice and inservice teachers within the sites.
4. The partnership must involve the simultaneous renewel of the schools and college.
5. College liaisons must maintain identify with both campuses.

In summary, Duffy (1994) notes the purpose of PDS as "vehicles for reform ... to be carried out in a spirit of collaborative egalitarianism" (p. 596). He continues that "if we succeed in reforming education, it will not be because we have created a PDS. It will be because teachers

and professors alike have been empowered to replace old attitudes and concepts with new ones" (p. 600).

Indeed it is a far, far better thing that we do than we have ever done; it is a far, far better school that we go to than we have ever known. (Our apologies to Charles Dickens for taking liberties with the Tale of Two Cities.)

This paper is dedicated to the memory of Dr. William Stokes for his commitment to quality in our teacher education program.

REFERENCES

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1991). Professional development schools and education reform: Concepts and concerns. Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document EDO-SP 91-2.

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1992). Professionalizing teaching: Is there a role for professional development schools? Washington, D.C.: ERIC Document EDO-SP 91-3.

Abdal-Haqq, I. (1992). Professional development schools: An annotated bibliography of selected ERIC resources. Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 42-45.

Arends, R. I. (1990). Connecting the university to the school. In ASCD Yearbook. Changing school culture through staff development, p. 117-143. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Barksdale-Ladd, M. A. (1994). Teacher empowerment and literacy instruction in three professional development schools. Journal of Teacher Education, 45, 104-111.

Boyd, P. C. (1994). Professional school reform and public school renewal: Portrait of a partnership. Journal of Teacher Education, 45, 132-139.

Brandt, R. (1991). On teacher education: A conversation with John Goodlad. Educational Leadership, 49, 11-13.

Carnegie Corp. of NY (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers in the 21st century. NY: Carnegie Corp. of NY.

Clark, R. W. (1990). What school leaders can do to help change teacher education. Washington, D.C. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Clark, R. J. & LaLonde, D. E. (1992). A case for department-based professional development sites for secondary teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 35-41.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1989). Accountability for professional practice. Teachers College Record, 91(1), pp. 59-80.

Dilworth, M. (1989). The nature of professional development schools. Washington, D.C. ERIC Document, EDO-SP 4-89.

Dixon, P. N. & Ishler, R. E. (1992). Professional development schools: Stages in collaboration. Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 28-34.

Duffy, G. G. (1994). Professional development schools and the disempowerment of teachers and professors. Phi Delta Kappan, 75, 596-600.

Ferris, P. J., Henniger, M., & Bischoff, J. A. (1991). After the wave of reform, the role of early clinical experiences in elementary teacher education. Action in Teacher Education, 8(2), 20-24.

Fullan, M. G. (1992). Visions that blind. Educational Leadership, 49, 19-20.

Garland, C. & Shippy, V. (1991). Improving the student teaching context: A rsearch-based program for cooperating teachers. Action in Teacher Education, 13(1), 37-41.

Glickman, C. (1993). The three-sided framework of a professional school: The critical study process. In Sites, 3(2), pp. 10-11.

Goodlad, J. I. (1983). A study of schooling: Some implications for school improvement. Phi Delta Kappan, 64, 552-558.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group. E. Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, Inc.

Holmes Group (1990). Tomorrow's schools: Principles for the design of professional development schools. E. Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, Inc.q

James, I. L., Etheridge, C. P. & Liles, D. A. (1991). Student teaching delivery via clinical training sites: New linkages, structural changes and programmatic improvements. Action in Teacher Education, 8(2), 25-29.

Lichtenstein, G., McLaughlin, M. W. & Knudsen, J. (1992). Teacher empowerment and professional knowledge. In A. Lieberman (Ed.), The Changing Contexts of Teaching (pp. 37-58). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Maeroff, G. I. (1988). The empowerment of teachers: Overcoming the crisis of confidence. NY: Teachers College Press.

Meade, E. J. (1991). Reshaping the clinical phase of teacher preparation. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 666-669.

Michelli, N. M. (1994, June). Investing in schools through teacher professional development. Washington, D.C: AACT Issue Paper.

Murphy, J. (1990). Helping teachers prepare to work in restructured schools. Journal of Teacher Education, 41, 50-56.

Olson, L. (1989, April 12). Clinical schools: Theory meets practice on the training ground. Education Week, 20(1), pp 9-12.

Pasch, S. H. & Pugach, M. C. (1990). Collaborative planning for urban professional development schools. Contemporary Education, 61(3), pp. 135-143.

Rushcamp, S. & Roehler, L. R. (1992). Characteristics supporting change in a professional development school. Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 19-27.

Sandholtz, J. H. & Merseth, K. K. (1992). Collaboration teachers in a professional development school: Inducements and contributions. Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 308-317.

Stahlbut, R. G. & Hawkes, R. R. (1990). Teacher empowerment in teacher education: A model for collaboration. Centering Teacher Education, 7(2), 7-9.

Stanulis, R. N. (1994). Fading to a whisper: One mentor's story of sharing her wisdom without telling answers. Journal of Teacher Education, 45 (1), pp 31-39.

Tyler, R. (1983). A place called school. Phi Delta Kappan, 64, 462-464.

Winitzky, N., Stoddart, T. & O'Keefe, P. (1992). Great expectations: Emergent professional development schools. Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 3-18.

Wise, A. E. (1991). We need more than a redesign. Educational Leadership, 49, p. 7.

Zeichner, K. (1992). Rethinking the practicum in the professional development school partnership. Journal of Teacher Education, 43, 296-307.

Zimpher, N. (1990). Creating professional development school sites. Theory into Practice, 29(1), pp. 42-49.